# CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT For the Rural Hospital Performance Improvement (RHPI) Project Delta Region

January 2003

Prepared by: Linda Powell, MSIPT For the:



### **CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT**

The Rural Hospital Performance Improvement (RHPI) Project is funded by the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy, HRSA, DHHS through a contract with Mountain States Group, Inc. in partnership with the National Rural Health Resource Center. There are three primary clients for the RHPI Project: the participating hospitals, consultants, and state partners. Three different survey forms are used to elicit feedback from the clients: all hospitals (comprehensive and targeted), consultants, and state partners. State partners are sent the survey near the end of the project year and the remaining hospital/consultant surveys are sent within one month of completion of consultations. Attachments A, B, and C contain copies of the survey forms. Attachment D contains the listing of hospitals, consultants, and state partners that received the survey forms (Distribution Form for Client Satisfaction).

For the first year of the Delta RHPI Project, Linda Powell of Mountain States Group, Inc. was recruited to conduct this client satisfaction evaluation. Though an employee of Mountain States Group, Linda was not involved in this project during the first year and her only responsibility is to conduct this survey and to assist in the development and design of the evaluation plan for year 2. This report summarizes all data received through January 16, 2003. It is comprised of three distinct sections: Hospital Survey Results, Consultant Survey Results, and State Partner Survey Results.

### I. Hospital Survey Results

Fifteen hospitals were sent a survey through the end of December 2002. As of January 16, 2003, fourteen hospitals returned surveys; one returned two surveys – one for each consultant. Follow-up requests, both written and telephone, were sent to the hospitals not responding to the initial request.

The hospital survey requested feedback on the consultants and also on the project itself. The following is a distribution of responses and comments provided to the questions asked.

### A. CONSULTANT FEEDBACK

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Consultant had the appropriate level of skills	11	4	0	0	0
Consultant had the appropriate level of knowledge	12	3	0	0	0
Consultant had the appropriate level of experience	12	3	0	0	0

• Consultants were very knowledgeable in all areas of hospital operations.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Consultant was able to understand the hospital functions	11	2	2	0	0
Consultant related well to staff	11	3	1	0	0

### Comments:

• One opinionated physician challenged the team

10	2	0	0	0
11	3	1	0	0
12	2	1	0	0
	10 11 12	10 2 11 3 12 2	10     2     0       11     3     1       12     2     1	10     2     0     0       11     3     1     0       12     2     1     0

### Comments:

• Worked well with administrator in this area.

Consultant was accessible	9	6	0	0	0
Consultant was responsive	11	3	1	0	0
Consultant's	10	3	2	0	0
recommendations were					
innovative & tailored					

### Comments:

- Particularly tailored.
- So many projects time limitations were at times a factor.

Recommendations were	10	3	2	0	0
appropriate					
Recommendations were	9	4	2	0	0
practical					
Report was well written	11	4	0	0	0

- Some more easy than others to implement.
- Recommendations from CPA and Attorney are not finalized.

Deadlines & commitments	10	5	0	0	0
were met & on time					
I would recommend this	11	3	1	0	0
consultant to others					

### COMMENTS:

- All three of the consultants (Eric Shell, Greg Wolf and Tom Bariocchi) were excellent.
  The process was nearly painless and the benefits far outweighed the investment of time
  and effort in preparation. We are very grateful to have received the comprehensive
  review. Thanks.
- I found the RHPI Project and conference very helpful and informative. I recommend it highly.
- I was <u>extremely</u> impressed with the comfort level expressed by hospital employees, Medical staff and Board Members while interviewing with Stroudwater representatives Brian Haapala, Thomas Baiocchi and Mary Guyot. The consultants were very professional yet personal and expressed an intense interest in our concerns.
- The consultant team was comprised of 3 members, all of which were excellent. They showed knowledge and examples and were extremely accurate in their assessment.

### What did the consultant do that was most helpful?

- Delineated current status and focused on more than one option. Gave details on how to measure success.
- Their comments regarding our relationship with the medical staff was very enlightening. Also the recommendation for future physician employment agreements.
- Work with the recommendations/validate goals to statistically validate the values of the goals.
- Encourage hospital board to expand business and to reach out into neighboring areas for business.
- Give us an overall review of our operations with recommendations.
- Very personable, made people feel at ease. Very well organized, used time effectively.
   Was prepared at start of project, had done homework.
- Very well organized, used time effectively. Made people feel at ease.
- Took time to listen.
- "Listened"
- Consultant met individually with staff members and Board members and was open for input from employees as well.
- Did a good overall review.
- Report was well done. On site visit helpful.
- Suggested we work with a larger hospital.

What does the consultant need to improve upon or pay attention to?

- n/a
- They did a fantastic job. I only wish they could have stayed on site longer.
- Drill down/more on site.
- n/a
- Perhaps scheduling two full days would have been more helpful to staff.
- We wanted some work on productivity standards and he didn't have any.
- If he is going to say anything negative about the administrator, make sure he covers that before he meets with the board. There is usually 2 sides.

### Other comments:

- Their performance exceeded our expectations. We would highly recommend this service to all hospitals.
- Thanks
- Outstanding project.
- I would highly recommend Stroudwater NHG consultants to other hospitals and/or agencies.

### B. RHPI PROJECT FEEDBACK

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Consultation was organized	13	2	0	0	0
Consultation was planned in an appropriate time frame	10	5	0	0	0

### Comments:

• I was one of the first hospitals so coordination details were not completely finalized.

Project staff were accessible	12	3	0	0	0
Project staff were responsive	13	1	1	0	0
Sufficient information was provided for planning the	10	5	0	0	0
consultation					

### Comments:

• Some mix-up on start. Again, first hospital.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Staff assigned consultant/s was/were helpful	13	2	0	0	0
Staff were helpful during the consultation	12	3	0	0	0
I would recommend this project to others	13	2	0	0	0

What changes would you recommend to improve services and process?

- Grateful to be invited.
- n/a
- None.
- None.

#### Other comments:

- This is the BEST consultation I have ever received, regardless of cost.
- Very pleased with consultants and survey process.
- Outstanding project.
- Outstanding project.
- Thanks, Joe Hammond
- Thank you
- Thank you! Yvonne Maddux, Interim CEO
- Christy Crosser real asset.

### **II. Consultant Survey Results**

Six consultants were sent a survey through the end of December 2002. As of January 16, 2003, five consultants returned surveys. Follow-up requests, both written and telephone, were sent to the consultants not responding to the initial request.

The consultant survey requested feedback on the consultation itself and the support from project staff. The following is a distribution of responses and comments provided to the questions asked.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Consultations held in your state were organized	3	1	0	0	0
Consultations were planned in an appropriate time frame	2	1	0	1	0

 Too many at one time over the summer! Coordination of contacts to hospital can be better.

Project staff were accessible	4	0	0	0	0
Project staff were responsive	4	0	0	0	0
Sufficient information was provided regarding consultations in your state	3	2	0	0	0

### Comments:

 Hospital profiles (UNC dudes) has helped, but can improve in preparing consultants for visit.

Staff assigned consultant/s was/were	3	1	1	0	0
helpful to the hospitals					
I would recommend this project to others	4	0	0	0	0

#### Comments:

- I enjoyed this assignment very much.
- Christy Crosser did an excellent job providing contact information and key resources. Mountain States staff was efficient and timely with payments.
- Administrator never returned phone calls.
- Christy works hard to stay on top of issues arising from consultation; focus on helping hospital administrators is key (as client); Linda helped get the surveys out of the muck.
- Limited need for staff support during the consultation.

What changes would you recommend to improve services and process?

- No a big factor, but an extra month would have helped.
- Admittedly took longer to get report to administrator than anticipated but he never contacted me to let me know he needed right away (they have very slow in decisionmaking). Was case of squeaky wheel. I assume administrator not happy by virtue of unreturned calls.

• More lead time in scheduling, better coordination with others (state partners), spread out through year versus over three months.

Other comments: None.

### III. State Partner Survey Results

Sixteen state partners were sent a survey through the end of December 2002. As of January 16, 2003, twelve state partners returned surveys. Follow-up requests, both written and telephone, were sent to the state partners not responding to the initial request.

The state partner survey requested feedback on the project itself and the support from project staff. The following is a distribution of responses and comments provided to the questions asked.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Consultations held in your state were organized	7	4	0	0	0
Consultations were planned in an appropriate time frame	6	5	0	0	0

#### Comments:

- Think there was some confusion in the start of the project but its working great now.
- Advanced noticed always given and arranged to meet both Barbara Dallas and my schedule. I appreciated the consideration.
- I have heard nothing but positive comments.

Draiget staff were appealible	7	1	0	0	0
Project staff were accessible	7	4	U	U	U
Project staff were responsive	7	3	1	0	0
Sufficient information was provided regarding consultations in your state	7	4	0	0	0

### Comments:

 Very impressed with the program coordinator and the project consultants -Professional, knowledgeable and take extra effort to keep all of us informed.

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Staff assigned consultant/s was/were helpful to the hospitals	8	2	1	0	0
I would recommend this project to others	10	1	0	0	0

- Hospitals appear to be very pleased.
- Same comments as above.

What changes would you recommend to improve services and process?

- More funding to the hospital component. It appears this part of the Delta Project is more effective than the discretionary grant program. It should have been more balanced.
- None.

- This program has provided great benefit to several of our hospitals.
- Staff are to be commended for way they have dealt with Alabama.
- Not enough history to respond. Several interactions with Christy Crosser, all were positive.
- The hospitals have shared positive comments about the program. The hospital CEOs relate the projects have been beneficial to their organization and planning processes.
   This is good because hospital CEOs could view these projects (pilot) as a hassle. Good job. The hospital CEOs feel honored to be selected and provided the opportunity.
- Hope to have more hospitals involved next year.

### **ATTACHMENT A**

### Rural Hospital Performance Improvement (RHPI) Project Mississippi Delta Region Hospital Feedback Survey

Name of hospital, city and state: _		
Date/s of consultation:		

## A. Please provide feedback regarding the consultant/s. If more than one consultant participated, you are invited to provide feedback on each consultant by copying this page and completing for each consultant. *Circle one number for each item.*

Consultant Name:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Consultant had the appropriate level of skills	5	4	3	2	1
Consultant had the appropriate level of knowledge	5	4	3	2	1
Consultant had the appropriate level of experience	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					
Consultant was able to understand the hospital	5	4	3	2	1
functions					
Consultant related well to staff	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:  Consultant related well to board members	5	4	3	2	1
	5		3	2	
Communications with consultant was effective	5	4	3	21	1
Consultant was able to transfer information & experience	3	4	3	21	1
Comments:					
Consultant was accessible	5	4	3	2	1
Consultant was responsive	5	4	3	2	1
Consultant's recommendations were innovative & tailored	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					
Recommendations were appropriate	5	4	3	2	1
Recommendations were practical	5	4	3	2	1
Report was well written	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:	1	1		1	
Deadlines & commitments were met & on time	5	4	3	2	1
I would recommend this consultant to others	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:	

What did the consultant do that was most helpful?

What does the consultant need to improve upon or pay attention to?

Other comments:

### B. Please provide feedback regarding the RHPI Project. Circle one number for each item.

	Strongly	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly
	Agree				Disagree
Consultation was organized	5	4	3	2	1
Consultation was planned in an appropriate time frame	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:	•	•	•	•	
Project staff were accessible	5	4	3	2	1
Project staff were responsive	5	4	3	2	1
Sufficient information was provided for planning the	5	4	3	2	1
consultation					
Comments:					
Staff assigned consultant/s was/were helpful	5	4	3	2	1
Staff were helpful during the consultation	5	4	3	2	1
I would recommend this project to others	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:	II.	1	l .	u .	JI.

What changes would you recommend to improve services and process?

### **ATTACHMENT B**

### Rural Hospital Performance Improvement (RHPI) Project Mississippi Delta Region

### **Consultant Feedback Survey**

Name of consultant:					
Name of hospital, city and state:					
Date/s of consultation:					
Please provide feedback regarding the RHPI	Project. Circ	le one nu	mber for e	ach item.	
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Consultation was organized	5	4	3	2	1
Consultation was planned in an appropriate time frame	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:	I	1		l l	

Staff were helpful during the consultation 

I would recommend this project to others 

Comments:

Comments:

Project staff were accessible

Project staff were responsive

planning the consultation

Sufficient information was provided for

What changes would you recommend to improve services and process?

### **ATTACHMENT C**

### Rural Hospital Performance Improvement (RHPI) Project Mississippi Delta Region State Partners Feedback Survey

Name:			
A consequent states			
Agency and state:			

Please provide feedback regarding the RHPI Project. Circle one number for each item.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Consultations held in your state were organized	5	4	3	2	1
Consultations were planned in an appropriate time frame	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					
Project staff were accessible	5	4	3	2	1
Project staff were responsive	5	4	3	2	1
Sufficient information was provided regarding consultations in your state	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					
Staff assigned consultant/s was/were helpful to the hospitals	5	4	3	2	1
I would recommend this project to others	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					

What changes would you recommend to improve services and process?

### **ATTACHMENT D**

### DISTRIBUTION FORM FOR CLIENT SATISFACTION

<b>TYPE</b>	CONTACT	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE
С	Eric Shell	Stroudwater Associates	443 Congress St, 4 <sup>th</sup> FI	Portland	ME	04101-3542	207-756-6090
С		Hoffman & Associates,	1406 Business Highway 18			53572	
	David Hoffman	Ltd	- 151 East, Suite 105	<u> </u>	WI		608-437-7440
С	Larry Pixley	Stroudwater Associates	443 Congress St, 4 <sup>th</sup> FI	Portland	ME	04101-3542	207-756-6090
С	Wolfgang W.		20611 E. Bothell-Everett				
	Klamp	MC Partners	Hwy #330	Bothell	WA	98012	425-385-8001
С		Email:					
	Jeff Eilers	jeff.eilers@lpnt.net					
С	Jonathan C.		DO D. 4404	<b>D</b>	N 45	044004404	007 000 0000
	Sprague	Rocky Coast Consulting	PO Box 1131		ME		207-990-0880
Н	Bob Coker	Greene County Hospital	509 Wilson Ave.	Eutaw	AL	35462	205.372.3388
Н		Ashley County Medical	1015 Unity Rd., P O Box			=100=	
	Russ Sword	Center	400	Crossett	AR		870.364.4111
Н	Franklin Wise	Fulton County Hospital	Highway 9, PO Box 517	Salem	AR	72576	870.895.2691
Н	H. William Hartley	Ferrell Hospital	1201 Pine St.	Eldorado	L	62930	618.273.3361
Н		Hamilton Memorial	611 S. Marshall Ave., PO				
	Randall Dauby	Hospital District	Box 429	McLeansboro	IL	62859	618.643.2361
Н		Livingston Hospital &					
	Yvonne Maddux	Healthcare Services	131 Hospital Dr.		KY		270.988.2299
H	Sue Jarrette	Franklin Medical Center	2106 Loop Road	Winnsboro	LA	71295	318.435.9411
Н	L J Pecot	Jackson Parish Hospital	165 Beech Spring Road	Jonesboro	LA	71251	318.259.4435
Н		Pointe Coupee General					
	Larry Ayers	Hospital	2202 False River Drive	New Roads	LA	70769	225.638.6331
Н		Riverland Medical	1700 North E 'E' Wallace				
	Vernon Stevens	Center	Blvd, P O Box 111	Ferriday	LA	71334	318.757.6551
Н		Humphreys County	500 CCC Road, PO Box				
	Debra Griffin	Memorial Hospital	510	Belzoni	MS	39038	662.247.3831

TYPE	CONTACT	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE
Н	Joe Hammond	North Sunflower County Hospital	840 N Oak Ave, P O Box 369	Ruleville	MS		662.756.2711
Н	Winfred Wilkinson	Sharkey Issaquena Community Hospital	108 S 4 St., P O Box 339	Rolling Fork	MS	39159	662.873.4395
Н	Mike Blome	Methodist Healthcare- Fayette Hospital	214 Lakeview Dr.	Somerville	TN	38068	901.465.0532
H	William Macri	Caldwell County Hospital	101 Hospital Rd., Box 410	Princeton	KY	42445	270.365.0300
SP	Clyde Barganier	OPCRH Alabama DPH	201 Monroe St RSA Tower, Suite 710, P O Box 303017	Montgomery	AL	36130-3017	334-206-5396
SP	Bill Rodgers	ORHP Arkansas DoH	5800 West 10th Street #401	Little Rock	AR	72205	501-661-2244
SP	Don Adams	Arkansas Hospital Association	419 Natural Resources Drive	Little Rock	AR	72205	501-224-7878
SP	Pat Schou	ORH Illinois DPH	535 West Jefferson	Springfield	IL.	62761	217-782-1624
SP	Carol Blevins Ormay	Kentucky Hospital Association	P O 436629	Louisville	KY	40253	502-426-6220
SP	John Matessino	Louisiana Hospital Association	9521 Brookline Avenue	Baton Rouge	LA	70809	225-928-0026
SP	David Lightwine	ORH Mississippi DOH	570 E Woodrow Wilson, PO Box 1700	Jackson	MS	39215-1700	601-576-7874
SP	Barry Backer	ORH Missouri DOH	920 Wildwood Drive, P O Box 570	Jefferson City	МО	65102-4102	573-751-6219
SP	Patrick Lipford	ORH Tennessee DOH	425 Fifth Avenue, North Crodell Hull-5th FI	Nashville	TN	37247-5245	Direct 615- 741-0388
SP	Nick Nichols	Missouri Hospital Association	4712 Country Club Dr, P O Box 60	Jefferson	МО	65102-0060	573-893-3700
SP	Bill Jolley	Tenneessee Hospital Association	500 Interstate Blvd. South	Nashville	TN	37210	615-256-8240

TYPE	CONTACT	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	PHONE
SP	,	Director, State Office of Rural Health	1201 Capitol Access Rd., P.O. Box 2870	Baton Rouge	LA	70821-2870	225-342-3814
SP	•	Kentucky Office of Rural Health	100 Airport Gardens Road, Suite 10	Hazard	KY	41701-9529	606-439-3557
SP		Illinois Hospital Association	1405 W. Main St., Ste. 2, P.O. Box 938	Carbondale	IL.	62903-0938	618-549-3335
SP		Mississippi Hospital Association	6425 Lakeover Road , PO Box 16444	Jackson	MS	39236-6444	800-289-8884
SP		Alabama Hospital Association	500 North East Blvd.	Montgomery	AL	36117	334-272-8781